

APR 16 2007

Docket No. 740756-2262
Application No. 09/777,693
Page 18REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action of January 4, 2007 has been received and its contents reviewed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to the above-identified application.

Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for a One-Month Extension of Time* which extends the shortened statutory period of response to May 4, 2007. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

Claims 1-10, 19-27, 36-45, 54-61 and 71-123 were pending with claims 1-10, 36-45, 54-61, 71-79 and 88-104 being withdrawn from consideration prior to the instant amendment. By this amendment, claims 19, 80, 105 and 115 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 19-27, 80-87 and 105-123 are pending, of which claims 19, 80, 105 and 115 are independent.

In the detailed Office Action, the drawings and the specification stand objected to with regard to features not shown or described in the figures or specification. Claims 19, 80, 105 and 115 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph with regard to features not shown or described in the figures or specification. Further, claims 19-27, 80-87 and 105-123 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for being indefinite. In the above amendments, Applicants have canceled such features and hereby respectfully request that these objections and rejections be withdrawn.

In addition, claims 19, 25, 80, 86-87, 105-106, 112, 115-116 and 122-123 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinya (U.S. Patent No. 5,170,158 – hereafter Shinya) in view of Lewis (U.S. Patent No. 5,589,847 – hereafter Lewis) and Yoshida et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2006/0132420 – hereafter Yoshida). Further, claims 20-24, 81-85, 107-111 and 117-121 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinya, Lewis and Yoshida, as applied to claims 19, 80, 105 and 115 above, and further in view of Luder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,642,117 – hereafter Luder). Still further, claims 26 and 113 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinya, Lewis and Yoshida, as applied to claims 19 and 105 above, and further in view of Friend et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,247,190 – hereafter Friend). Finally, claims 27 and 114 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinya, Lewis and Yoshida, as applied to claims 19 and 105 above, and further in view of Matsueda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,806 – Matsueda). These rejections are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons

10516518.1

Docket No. 740756-2262
Application No. 09/777,693
Page 19

provided below.

In response to the rejections, in order to further distinguish the claimed invention over Shinya, Lewis and Yoshida, Applicants have amended independent claims 19, 80, 105 and 115, as shown above, to recite, *inter alia*, the feature of "signal line selecting circuits start and stop transmitting the output signals of the plurality of D/A converter circuits while the supply of the clock signal is being stopped." Support for the amended feature can be found at least on, e.g., page 11, lines 23 to page 12, line 16 of the specification and in FIGS. 1 and 2. In contrast with Applicants' presently claimed invention, Shinya, Lewis and Yoshida fail to teach, disclose or suggest the feature of plurality of signal line selecting circuits which start and stop transmitting the output signals of the plurality of D/A converter circuits while the supply of the clock signal is being stopped.


The requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, as detailed in MPEP § 2143 - 2143.03 (pages 2100-122 - 2100-136), are: first, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference to combine the teachings; second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and, finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. As Shinya, Lewis and Yoshida are deficient as discussed above, the combination of Shinya, Lewis and Yoshida with Luder, Friends and/or Matsueda is improper.

10516518.1

Docket No. 740756-2262
Application No. 09/777,693
Page 20

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 19-27, 80-87 and 105-123 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue. If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,


Sean A. Pryor
Registration No. 48,103

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000

10516518.1